

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

CHARLESTON DIVISION

RHONDA L. BRISCOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:12-cv-01028

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Rhonda L. Briscoe's Complaint seeking review of the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security¹ ("Commissioner") [ECF 2]. By Standing Order entered September 2, 2010 and filed in this case on April 10, 2012, this action was referred to former United States Magistrate Judge Mary E. Stanley for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Stanley filed her PF&R [ECF 9] on February 21, 2013, recommending that this Court affirm the final decision of the Commissioner and dismiss this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this

¹ Carolyn W. Colvin became the Acting Commissioner of Social Security on February 14, 2013, replacing the former Social Security Commissioner, Michael J. Astrue, the original Defendant in this case. Pursuant to Rule 25(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Ms. Colvin is automatically substituted as the Defendant.


Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir.1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections to the PF&R were due on March 11, 2013. To date, no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [ECF 9], **AFFIRMS** the final decision of the Commissioner, **DISMISSES** the Complaint [ECF 2], and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this case from the Court's docket.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: May 28, 2013



THOMAS E. JOHNSTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE